

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Northern States Power Company
Monticello Station

Docket No. 50-263
License No. DPR-22

During an NRC inspection conducted June 2-6, 1997, violations of NRC requirements were identified. In accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," NUREG 1600, the violations are listed below:

10 CFR 50.65(a)(1) requires, in part, the holders of an operating license shall monitor the performance or condition of structures, systems or components (SSCs), against licensee-established goals, in a manner sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that such SSCs as defined in 10 CFR 50.65(b), are capable of fulfilling their intended functions. Such goals shall be established commensurate with safety. When the performance or condition of a SSC does not meet established goals, appropriate corrective action shall be taken.

10 CFR 50.65(a)(2) requires, in part, that monitoring as specified in 10 CFR 50.65 paragraph (a)(1) is not required where it has been demonstrated that the performance or condition of a SSC is being effectively controlled through the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance, such that the SSC remains capable of performing its intended function.

Contrary to 10 CFR 50.65(a)(2), as of July 10, 1996, the time that the licensee elected to not monitor the performance or condition of certain SSCs against licensee-established goals pursuant to the requirements of Section (a)(1), the licensee had not demonstrated that the performance or condition of certain SSCs within the scope of 10 CFR 50.65 were being effectively controlled through the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance, as evidenced by the following examples, each of which constitute a separate violation:

- A. The licensee had not demonstrated that the performance of the primary containment isolation system, the diesel fuel oil standby pump, the reactor building component cooling water standby pump, and primary radiation monitors were being effectively controlled through the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(a)(2). Specifically, the licensee had failed to establish adequate measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance on these SSCs prior to placing these SSCs under Section (a)(2). The licensee had performed preventive maintenance on the SSCs; however, the appropriateness had not been adequately evaluated for SSC reliability or unavailability, which was necessary to demonstrate the effectiveness of preventive maintenance. As a result, it was not demonstrated that the systems were controlled such that they remained capable of performing their intended function. Therefore, the licensee's technical basis for placing these SSCs under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(a)(2) was inadequate and these standby SSCs should have been monitored in accordance with 10 CFR 50.65(a)(1) (263/97007-01(DRS)).

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I).

- B. The licensee had not demonstrated that the performance of the residual heat removal pumps, the residual heat removal service water pumps, the standby service

9707220002 970716
PDR ADOCK 05000263
Q PDR

water pumps, the safety relief valves, and the reactor core isolation cooling system were being effectively controlled through the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(a)(2). Specifically, the licensee had failed to establish adequate measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the performance of appropriate preventive maintenance on these high safety (risk) significant SSCs prior to placing these SSCs under Section (a)(2). The measures were inadequate because there was not a technical justification to allow these SSCs to have reliability and availability measures that were inconsistent with the assumptions in the licensee's probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). The measures established for these SSCs would allow failure rates that were between one and two orders of magnitude greater than the reliability and availability assumptions in the licensee's PRA. Thus, multiple failures or high unavailability would need to occur before the licensee considers moving these SSCs to the (a)(1) category. As a result, it was not demonstrated that the systems were controlled such that they remained capable of performing their intended function. Therefore, the licensee's technical basis for placing these SSCs under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(a)(2) was inadequate and these high safety (risk) SSCs should have been monitored in accordance with 10 CFR 50.65(a)(1) (263/97007-02(DRS)).

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement I).

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Northern States Power Company is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555, with a copy to the Regional Administrator, Region III, and a copy to the NRC Resident Inspector at the facility that is the subject of this Notice of Violation 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation (Notice). This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include for each violation: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the violation, (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved, (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations, and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an Order or a Demand for Information may be issued as to why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time. Because your response will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), to the extent possible, it should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be placed in the PDR without redaction. However, if you find it necessary to include such information, you should clearly indicate the specific information that you desire not to be placed in the PDR, and provide the legal basis to support your request for withholding the information from the public.

Dated at Lisle, Illinois
this 16th day of July 1997